

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA  
BEFORE THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

DOCKET No. 2012-203-E

<p><b>IN MATTER OF:</b> Petition of South Carolina Electric &amp; Gas Company for Updates and Revisions to Schedules Related to the Construction of a Nuclear Base Load Generation Facility at Jenkinsville, South Carolina</p>	<p><b>MOTION TO RECONSIDER DENIAL OF THE PETITION TO INTERVENE</b></p>
---	--

The PSC Commission Action directing to deny my, Joseph Wojcicki's Petition to Intervene has several omissions, follows misleading information. Disinformation from SSCANA legal department and does not protect public interest existing in Nuclear Renaissance.

- SCANA/SCE&G ("Company") is ignoring / breaching their shareholder rights by objecting my petition to intervene. They have not states / cited any of such restrictions.
- In their document: SCANA\_ Return...\_Argument cites SC Supreme Court cases that are completely irrelevant to the situation in very risky multi-billion SCANA investment in Nuclear Renaissance. In general and in details. E.g. cited cases covers: "injures ...created by sand", "deer on Hilton Head Island", etc. It is another proof of SCANA trial to mislead Commission.
- At least [beside knowledge], two rights / undisputed facts are essential here: **shareholding and NRC 50 – mile rule** for residence automatically eliminating SCE&G claims rewritten in Commission Action. Of course - "*Company is [not] correct*". Commission Action sees erroneously Wojcicki's rights "*both conjectural and hypothetical*" which seems to anyway ignore well-known and long list of claims, including e.g. significant property value decrease and so many factors cited by environmentalists and being approved by Federal Authorities to prove their standing. The drought problem [to be enforced / extended by Units 2 and 3] should be known to PSC as well.
- Company has not proven [according to new safety rules / design] that their project is safe for new units. It is not proved that is safe even for existing unit # 1.
- Last nuclear power plant disasters (Chernobyl and especially Fukushima) introduced the new approach to protections. These requirements did not exist in 2008 when PSC reviewed SCE&G Application. Some physical requirements are in NRC licensing documents, e.g. by Dr. Jaczko.
- The situation of all parties in 2009 (docket 2009-498-E) were before Fukushima and new NRC "learned lessons". Therefore today's Wojcicki's Petition has undisputable standing – he is share – and stakeholder with knowledge perfectly oriented to the new industry situation even in its behalf.
- ORS has no experts that may represent such knowledge in explosion prevention / protection like I have. It is seriously risky to leave this case in the hands of unprepared lawyers. Note how many \$billions are put into the Nuclear Renaissance that they must not fail by such refusal of technical / engineering and environmental newly revealed and necessary preventions. SCE&G

RECEIVED

licensing was not received unanimously without having unconditional, full approval of Units 2 and 3 presented protection that shall fully prevent disasters and their consequences to over a million residents living in 50-mile air/land/ river distance from Jenkinsville.

NRC already accepted their long- lasting rule of 50-mile radius for several petitioners. And there is no presented by SCANA SC laws that overrule or change this distance. SCANA did run process before PSC in the way that did create and will create problems for national security and economy. Even shown here facts of misleading / misrepresentation seems to insult of authority of PSC, public interest of both sides: pro – and anti-nuclear, democrats and republicans. Such SCANA “Legal action” is violating SC Professional Ethics, at least according to: SOUTH CAROLINA BAR STANDARDS OF PROFESSIONALISM

*2. Principle: A lawyer should further the legal profession’s devotion to **public service and to the public good.***

Therefore, the honorable members of Commission are asked to reconsider their denial and grant full set of rights as an intervenor to Wojcicki. Note - also that on the other hand there is no danger (rather giving positive review) to extent any discussion with new element of safety learned from Fukushima, **or there is something to hide from stockholders/stakeholders,-isn’t it?** Nuclear Renaissance has national security and world impact but was ignored in Chernobyl and Fukushima. NRC limited significantly their review for probably time reason, practically to Toshiba / Westinghouse AP 1000 project making ORS/PSC fully responsible for peripheral installations, equipment, natural resource etc.

Respectfully submitted,

Joseph Wojcicki – MSEE, consultant in BYPAS INTERNATIONAL

820 East Steele Road. West Columbia, SC 29170-1125

2012 June 25

MAIL / DMS